

VU Research Portal

General Grammar in the Netherlands, 1670-1900

Noordegraaf, J.

published in

Sprachtheorien der Neuzeit II. Von der Grammaire de Port-Royal (1660) zur Konstitution moderner linguistischer Disziplinen

1996

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

Noordegraaf, J. (1996). General Grammar in the Netherlands, 1670-1900. In P. Schmitter (Ed.), *Sprachtheorien der Neuzeit II. Von der Grammaire de Port-Royal (1660) zur Konstitution moderner linguistischer Disziplinen* (pp. 94-121). (Geschichte der Sprachtheorie; No. 5). Gunter Narr.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl

GENERAL GRAMMAR IN THE NETHERLANDS 1670-1900

Jan Noordegraaf

VU University Amsterdam

0. Introductory remarks

Until the 1970s historians of linguistics in the Netherlands never used the terms 'general grammar' or 'Allgemeine Grammatik' to characterize the type of linguistic research on which so much has been written in the past decades. It can be argued, however, that for the Netherlands a tradition of general grammar must also be distinguished, be it a rather limited one. In this contribution I would like to give an overview of the vicissitudes of this Dutch tradition. For the greater part my sketch is based on the results of research carried out by various Dutch scholars in the years 1975-1990.

The history of Dutch linguistics is dealt with in Bakker & Dobbins 1977. This book, which focusses mainly on the history of the study of Dutch, was complemented by van Driel & Noordegraaf 1982, and, more recently, by Noordegraaf, Versteegh & Koerner 1992. In Stellmacher 1992 one also finds a concise discussion of the earliest period of Dutch linguistics. As to general grammar in the Netherlands, indispensable studies have been written by van der Wal (1977), van Driel (1988, 1989, 1992), and Hulshof (1985). Furthermore, my own studies on various aspects of general grammar in Holland, published during the last fifteen years or so, will be incorporated in the present contribution.

In spite of the fact that a fair amount of research has been done in this field during the past decade, I cannot claim to give a comprehensive and neatly-patterned history of the subject here.¹ Most importantly, as general grammar never was a mainstream activity, the relevant material is rather scarce and scattered, for in the Netherlands 'we find no large production of general grammars like in France and in Germany', as van der Wal (1977: 50) once remarked, and I would like to underline her statement. Secondly, given the information available, it was not feasible to pay special attention to the study and the teaching of foreign languages, both of European and exotic languages. It remains a subject of further research to point out exactly [95] to what extent general grammar has been put to use in Dutch foreign language study and teaching. Yet, in this respect it seems illuminating to cast a glance at school grammar, viz. the teaching of Dutch, where important notions from general grammar merge with notions borrowed from traditional grammar and, later on, historical grammar.

My sketch follows a chronological line. First, I shall deal with some seventeenth and eighteenth-century activities in the field of general grammar which were probably inspired by the example of Port-Royal. Subsequently, I shall go on to discuss developments in nineteenth-century Dutch linguistics, where it is the German influence that is most conspicuous. Finally, attention will be paid to the position of the Dutch grammarians within the European context.

¹ I would like to emphasize that many interesting facts concerning the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries have been uncovered only during the last fifteen years or so. The nineteenth century has been the subject of a detailed investigation from 1977 on, whereas systematic research into eighteenth-century linguistics has developed only quite recently. Given the scarcity of data I shall not go into the question whether we should make a distinction between general grammar, philosophical grammar and universal grammar (cf. Aurox 1983: 3-5), and I shall venture to bring all activities under the same denominator.

1. The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries

1.1. Introduction

From the second half of the sixteenth century on, grammarians of Dutch were actively engaged in building a Dutch standard language. Seventeenth-century grammarians mainly took an interest in spelling and prescriptive grammar, the Latin grammatical tradition playing a major role in their considerations. The system and categories of Latin grammar were attributed a more or less universal character, and, what is more, the Latin system was used as a universal tool of analysis not only to describe the vernacular language in a systematic way, but also to order and to develop it (cf. Ruijsendaal 1991). The eighteenth century, too, was to a large extent dominated by discussions concerning spelling and language norms. The few important grammars that were published were set up after the classic 'partes' model. Alongside the continuation of this traditional prescriptive trend in linguistics the eighteenth century saw the emergence of an historical approach in linguistics, in which the works of Lambert ten Kate (1674-1731), often considered as a forerunner of Jacob Grimm (1785-1863), take pride of place. Works in which 'universal' aspects are touched upon are rare in these periods. Still, I would like to point to a few interesting books.

In 1635, Petrus Montanus (Peter Berch, 1594/95-1638) published his *Bericht van een nieuwe konst, genaemt de spreeckonst* ('Instruction in a new art, called the art of pronunciation/speech'). This book on phonetics is one of the most remarkable books in the history of Dutch linguistics (cf. Hulsker 1991, 1992). In principle, Montanus's theory could be applied to any language, so that we could aptly characterize it as a universal phonetics. Influenced by the Dutch scholar Simon Stevin (1548-1620), who propagated the idea that Dutch was the most suitable language to express scientific knowledge, Montanus wrote his highly original study in Dutch. He characterized his book as a *Theoria* ('reflection'), claiming it was "a higher description" of the art of speech, difficult even for learned men. In the *Spreeckonst* one finds a distinction being made between a "Gemene Spreeckonst" ('general art of speech') and the "Byzondere [96] Spreeckonsten" ('special arts of speech'), treating individual languages as German, Latin, Hebrew, etc.

In the same year, Gerardus Joannes Vossius (1577-1649) published his *De arte grammatica libri septem*, which soon became a most influential work both within and outside the Netherlands. From the second edition (1662) on it is known as *Aristarchus sive de arte grammatica libri septem*. In the first chapter Vossius propounds, in opposition to Julius Caesar Scaliger (1484-1558), that grammar is an *ars*, not a *scientia*, or, more correctly, that his (V.'s) grammar is no *scientia*. Recognizing the right of a grammar which is a *scientia*, a general grammar, he himself, however, wishes to present an *ars*, in this case, of Latin (cf. Luhrman 1984: 249ff.). His division of grammar into *grammatica naturalis* (common to all languages) and *grammatica artificialis* (peculiar to a given language) seems to be something new (cf. Verburg 1981). As Padley points out, what is also new is his insistence on anomalous structures being rewritten as structures semantically congruent with a logical proposition containing a subject and predicate. Vossius did not, however, write a universal grammar, as much of his work is in the spirit of the grammarians of the latter part of the seventeenth and the eighteenth century. He stands in a continental European line of development that runs from Scaliger and Sanctius to the Port-Royal grammar and the rationalism of Descartes (Padley 1976: 131). It is the spirit of Port-Royal which I would now like to turn to.

1.2. The French connection

In 1669, the Amsterdam Art Society *Nil Volentibus Arduum* was founded. The aim of this society was to study both science and literature, but it soon concentrated on poetry and drama. What is more, we also know that its members were highly interested in grammar. In 1671, eleven years after the publication of the first edition of the *Grammaire générale et raisonnée*, Lodewijk Meyer (1629-1681), a Cartesian philosopher and a friend of Benedictus de Spinoza's (1632-1677), was commissioned to write a "Grammatica Generalis". When reading

the extracts of the lost minutes of this society (cf. Dongelmans 1982) one can keep a close track of these attempts to write a full general grammar in Dutch. Although it is known that Meyer had been reading from several chapters of this *Algemeene Spraakkunst* ('General Grammar') as late as 1677, it should be assumed that he never managed to finish it. At any rate, the book never appeared in print.

In 1671, other members of the Society also started working on a *Nederduitsche Grammatica* ('Dutch Grammar'), which was modelled after the "Grammatica Generalis" I just mentioned. Actually, this grammar was finished, for we know of at least two serious attempts to get the book published.² As it [97] turned out, in 1728 only the first three chapters of its first part, concerning 'Accentus' and 'Metaplasmus', were published under the title *Verhandelungen Van der Letteren Affinitas of Verwantschap* ('Treatises on the Letters' Affinity'), with Gerard van Papenbroek (1673-1743), the son of one of the members of Nil Volentibus Arduum, acting as its editor. In 1738, Balthazar Huydecoper (1695-1778), an influential Amsterdam man of letters, still had the opportunity to consult the manuscript of this unpublished *Nederduitsche Grammatica*.³ And as late as 1773, the classical scholar Herman Tollius (1742-1822), expressed the hope that the full grammar would be published by the then owner of the manuscript (Dongelmans 1982: 17-18). This was the last time it the actual manuscript was mentioned in contemporary writings. Some thirty years later the full manuscript was probably destroyed as a result of the notorious gun powder boat explosion at Leiden on 12 January 1807, an explosion which caused the destruction of many houses and many other valuable manuscripts (cf. Dibbets 1991: 11).

In 1672, Meyer's *Italiaansche Spraakkunst* ('Italian Grammar') appeared anonymously. This grammar is based on the same principles as the *Nederduitsche Grammatica*. In the introduction Meyer points out to his readers how he conceives of the relation between an "*Algemeene (Generalis) ofte Natuurlijke (Naturalis)*" grammar, a General Grammar, and a "*Byzondere (Specialis), ofte Konstige (Artificialis)*" grammar, a Special Grammar. He criticizes his predecessors remarking that even "the greatest Grammarians, and Masters who have written on this Art" have not always followed the right course. Meyer explains that it had been his intention to write a general grammar first and then to attach the Italian grammar to it. However, as the book became too voluminous, he decided to adopt only the essential parts from the general grammar "without which the special grammar on the Italian tongue would be incomprehensible". Thus, Meyer made it clear that the Italian grammar should be considered a derivative of the general grammar. As to "the special rules concerning the Italian Tongue" Meyer not only consulted Claude Lancelot's (1616-1695) *Nouvelle Méthode pour apprendre la Langue Italienne* (1660), but also various other Italian textbooks of a more practical character.⁴

After Meyer's death in 1681, the Society slowly fell into decline. It is assumed that this seventeenth-century attempt to write a general grammar as a basis for grammars of other languages was inspired by the example of Port-Royal [98] (Dongelmans 1982: 79). The first half of the eighteenth century witnessed a "Blüte der Allgemeingrammatik in Deutschland"

² In 1683, it was decided "to have the grammar printed" (Dongelmans 1982: 239), and in 1707 Nil received from the Provincial States of Holland the privilege to publish "a Dutch grammar" (Dongelmans 1982: 413).

³ In 1763, Adriaan Kluit (1735-1807), later to become professor of Dutch History at Leiden University, noted that he had actually seen the grammar, which was kept in the library of one of his friends. Cf. Adriaan Kluit, "Vertoog over de spelling der Nederduitsche taal". *Nieuwe bijdragen tot opbouw der vaderlandsche Letterkunde. Eerste deel*. Leyden: Pieter van der Eyck 1763, 288-289 note (d).

⁴ When taking into regard the long standing tradition of foreign language teaching in Holland, one should expect that some of the Dutch 'language masters' based their handbooks on products of general grammar trend. However, up to now, Meyer's *Italiaansche Spraakkunst* of 1672 is the sole book I have been able to find in the period before 1800 which is directly derived from a 'general grammar'. Corleva's French grammar never appeared in print.

(Weiß 1992: 28), which was inspired by the conception of philosophy of Christian Wolff (1679-1754), in whose work we find a general grammar worked out. The Netherlands, however, did not experience such an "Aufschwung der Universalgrammatik" at the time, and no influence from the contemporary German *grammaticae universales* on Dutch grammar has ever been pointed out. On the contrary, the French connection was to be continued.

The year 1713 saw the publication of an *Ontwerp van eene Nederduytsche spraekkonst*, 'Sketch of a Dutch grammar' (cf. De Vos 1939: 49-50). This book appeared in Utrecht, although its title page tells the reader that it was published in the city of Meenen (Menin), now in Belgium. This commercial trick, however, does not come as a surprise, given the fact that this book had been composed 'for the Land of Flanders' in particular. Its author announced himself as E.C.P., that is Egidius Candidus Pastor, one of the numerous pseudonyms used by Aegidius De Witte (1648-1721), a Jansenist priest who had studied at Louvain. In 1674, De Witte left for Paris to continue his studies at Port-Royal, where he came into close contact with Antoine Arnauld (1612-1694). When a priest at the city of Mechelen, in Belgium, De Witte became the victim of anti-Jansenist actions. Consequently, in the year 1693 he decided to leave for Utrecht, a safe haven for Jansenists in the Northern part of the Low Countries. As has been pointed out by Dibbets (1994), De Witte's *Ontwerp* is a 'grammatica specialis', a grammar of the Dutch language, mainly based on the works of contemporary Dutch grammarians. It is evident, however, that the general definitions the *Ontwerp* presents bear the stamp of the *Grammaire générale et raisonnée*, written by Claude Lancelot (1616-1695) and De Witte's teacher, 'le grand Arnauld'.⁵ As it appears, the *Ontwerp* is the only Dutch grammar from the early eighteenth century which clearly shows the influence of the Port-Royal grammar.

In 1740, Johanna Corleva (1698-1752), an Amsterdam 'savante', published her *Algemeene en geredeneerde spraakkonst*, the very first translation of the *Grammaire générale et raisonnée*. Corleva's translation into Dutch is based on the text of the second edition (1664) of the Port-Royal grammar.⁶ Unfortunately, we are not particularly well-informed about the life and times of Johanna Corleva, who as a woman grammarian really is an avis rara in Dutch history. [99] However, we do know that she published one more book, *De Schat der Nederduitsche Wortel-woorden*, which also carries the French title of *Le Trésor des Mots Originaux, de la Langue Flamande*. It appeared in Amsterdam in 1741 and was dedicated to Balthasar Huydecoper (1695-1778), an alderman of the city of Amsterdam and a well-known supporter of the 'grammaire générale' doctrine. Corleva felt inspired by the critical remarks concerning contemporary linguistic usage which Huydecoper had made in the introduction to his play *Achilles* (1719).

To the *Trésor* the bookseller added a note to the reader in which he informed his customers that he had in print several of Corleva's other books "concerning the perfection of the Languages". Among them were both a *Fransche Letter-konst* ('French Grammar') as well as a *Nieuwe Nederduitsche Spraakkonst* ('New Dutch grammar'), based on the principles of the general grammar already published, a Dutch rhyming dictionary and the complete philosophical works of Pierre Bayle, which by then had already been translated in full by Miss Corleva from the French and the Latin into Dutch. As far as we know, the books announced by the bookseller never appeared in print.

⁵ As is well-known, Arnauld left France in 1679 and spent the rest of his life in exile in what was then called the Spanish Netherlands, "und liess sich in Brüssel nieder, wo er weiterhin gegen die Jesuiten polemisierte" (Schoninger 1993: 512). It might be possible that Arnauld saw his former student De Witte regularly during the years he spent in the Netherlands.

⁶ As the book is very rare, I may cite the title in full: *Algemeene en geredeneerde spraakkonst, behelzende De Grondregelen van de Konst van wel te spreken, op een klaare en natuurlijke wyze uitgelegt: de redenen van 't geen aan alle Taalen gemeen is: de redenen der voornaamste verscheidenheden die zig daar omtrent opdoen: en veel nieuwe Aanmerkingen over de Fransche Taal. Door de Heeren van Port-Royal in 't Fransch geschreven: En in 't Nederduitsch vertaald door Johanna Corleva*

By translating the *Grammaire générale et raisonnée* Corleva linked up with linguistic activities that had gone before. She took up the same approach as the grammarians of Nil Volentibus Arduum, writing a Dutch and a French grammar which were both based on a general grammar. In this respect she could have found some inspiration in the efforts made a number of decades earlier by the grammarians of Nil, whose general grammar was published in part for the first time in the late 1720s. It is possible that she, like Huydecoper, was informed about the attempts which had been made without too many tangible results by her fellow townsmen in the 1670s.

The special design of her dictionaries in combination with the grammars she composed clearly shows that Corleva was well aware of the problems in (foreign) language learning (cf. Noordegraaf (1994)). To her, the method of learning was a pedagogical problem, and the method should serve to shorten the job of learning, to relieve the burden of memory. Hence her outspoken claim of "the lightness" of her own method. What she had in mind was the idea that whoever had learned the rules laid down in the general grammar, could master in an efficient way the grammar of a particular language (Dutch, French); whoever had learned the root words of a language from the dictionary (Dutch, French) could form rather quickly all other words of that same language. It is this underlying rationalistic idea that is the link between Corleva's grammatical and lexicographical works.

The *Algemeene en geredeneerde spraakkonst* was "printed for the translator", which means that it must have had only a limited circulation. One of the few references to the book can be found in the bibliography added to the *Néderduitsche Spraakkonst* ('Dutch Grammar', 1781) by the "maître de pension" Ernst Zeydelaar (1742-1820), a prolific writer and compiler. Zeydelaar was also the author of the *Grammaire générale raisonnée françoise et hollandaise* (1768), and in 1781 he published a *Grammaire raisonnée* [100] *hollandaise* as well (cf. Riemens 1919: 233). Now, the expression 'grammaire générale' has often been used too widely to include works to which it does not directly apply (Auroux 1983: 2), and this is also the case with Zeydelaar, in spite of the fact that his works are mentioned in connection with general grammar by van der Wal (1977: 50, 85) and Auroux (1983: 3). His grammar of 1768, for instance, was presented in the form of a question-and-answer dialogue, which from the sixteenth century on was the traditional form in which schoolbooks for the teaching of foreign languages were presented, and Zeydelaar's book does not greatly differ from what was customary in those days. In 1772, he published a Dutch translation of the fifth edition (1766) of *Le Maître de la Langue allemande, ou nouvelle Grammaire allemande méthodique & raisonnée* (1753¹), a book for learning German, mainly based on the works of the German grammarian Johann Christoph Gottsched (1700-1766) (cf. Noordegraaf 1979). Behind Zeydelaar's 1781 grammar a traditional textbook for Frenchmen "de distinction", "qui veulent apprendre cette langue" is hidden. Whatever French influences may have played a role in the case of Zeydelaar - for instance, Gabriel Girard's (1677-1748) *Synonymes François* (1736) one of his sources -, they did not express themselves prominently enough to label Zeydelaar as a follower of the French *grammaire générale*.

As is well-known, the end of the eighteenth century and the first decades of the nineteenth century saw the publication or reprint of a large number of voluminous French 'grammaires générales', most of them in varying degrees associated with the line of thought of the French *Idéologues* (cf. Schlieben-Lange a.o. 1989-1994). This phase of the French *grammaire générale* was a flourishing one, but it had, as far as one can see, no real impact on Dutch linguistics.⁷ Only a work such as R.A.C. Sicard's (1742-1822), *Éléments de grammaire*

⁷ The sole Dutch city which had an *École Centrale*, where courses on 'grammaire générale' were given (1798-1804), was the city of Maastricht, the capital of the province of Limburg, which together with a part of Limburg was annexed by France in 1795 as the department of the "Meuse inférieure". At the occasion of the official opening of this school, in July 1798, the teacher of "grammaire générale", Jean Baptiste Coignard (cf. Schlieben-Lange 1992: 230), praised grammarians such as Du Marsais, Girard, D'Olivet, Court de Gébelin and Condillac. In his course for advanced students he made use of the new grammar by Sicard (1799). Among the handbooks he recommended we find Wailly, *Grammaire Française* (1754¹, 1782⁹), the Port-Royal grammar, Restaut, *Traité de*

générale, appliqués à la langue française (1799) I found referred to more than occasionally by various Dutch grammarians. To this one may add Sylvestre de Sacy's (1758-1838) *Principes de grammaire générale* (1799), which was certainly known amongst Dutch Arabic scholars (cf. Noordegraaf 1985: 543). It was Germany, however, which was to provide the great example. For instance, when in 1801 Pieter Weiland (1754-1842) was commissioned by the government of the 'Batavian Republic', a close ally of France at the time, to write a grammar which could be used as a guideline for civil servants and teachers, he chose Johann Christoph Adelung's (1732-1806) *Umständliches [101] Lehrgebäude* of 1782 as a model. It is obvious that he did not get his inspiration from one of the many contemporary French *grammaires générales*, for his *Nederduitsche Spraakkunst* ('Dutch Grammar', 1805) is a prescriptive grammar which can best be considered as a neat adaptation of Adelung's *Lehrgebäude*. Being authorized by the government it became an influential book. To my mind, Weiland's decision to follow Adelung should also be seen from a more practical point of view: given the close relationship between German and Dutch it is much easier to rewrite a German grammar into a Dutch one than to do the same with a French grammar, Weiland must have thought.⁸

Weiland's contemporary, the controversial polyhistor and poet Willem Bilderdijk (1756-1831), a most prolific author on things grammatical, was a more original mind. If the word 'philosopher' had not been misused to such a considerable degree, Bilderdijk argued, he would not have hesitated to present his *Nederlandsche Spraakleer* ('Dutch grammar') of 1826 as a real "philosophical grammar", having reduced all elements in it to a set of fixed principles. The linguist and philosopher Johannes Kinker (1764-1845), however, curtly concluded that Bilderdijk's book was nothing but a special grammar, be it a very special one indeed.

Having lived in England for some time, Bilderdijk was acquainted with the works of James Harris (1709-1780) and John Horne Tooke (1736-1812), representatives of the tradition of universal grammar in England. In the wake of Charles de Brosses's (1709-1777) *Traité de la formation mécanique des langues et des principes physiques de l'étymologie* (1765) and Antoine Court Gëbelin's (1728-1784) *Histoire naturelle de la parole ou grammaire universelle* (1776, repr. 1816) he practised what was called by Kinker a purely "empirical general linguistics", basing himself on data from some thirty languages, and striving at the reconstruction of the 'root letters' in the *lingua primaeva*.

The point made by Kinker that Bilderdijk practised a purely empirical general linguistics is a good reason to have a brief look at the philosophical background of linguistics in Holland in the eighteenth century. As was remarked by Visser (1974), Bilderdijk was convinced of the importance of collecting facts in full, and as such he was a proponent of the inductive method. It had been the works by the Dutch physicist Willem Jacob 's Gravesande, the *Introductio ad philosophiam, metaphysicam et logicam continens* (1736) and the famous *Physices elementa mathematica experimentis confirmata sive introductio ad philosophiam Newtonianam* (1720-21), which had had a profound influence on [102] the young Bilderdijk. These books, as he put it himself, had given to his mind "eene nieuwe wijze van denken" ('a new way of thinking'). In later years he showed his great admiration for Francis Bacon. Although on religious grounds he was of the opinion that natural science could not reveal the real essence of things, it can be concluded that Bilderdijk was a proponent of empiricism. In

l'orthographe française (1752); the works by Girard and Roubaud on synonyms, and Pluche, *Mécanique des langues* (1751). Cf. Spekkens 1951, passim.

⁸ Hundred years before, Arnold Moonen (1644-1711) had done the same when he wrote his *Nederduitsche Spraakkunst* (1706), the most important Dutch grammar of the eighteenth century, which remained influential until the publication of Weiland 1805. Moonen's book can be considered to be a summa of Dutch grammatical thinking from the late sixteenth century on. For that matter, it draws heavily upon Justus Georg Schottelius's (1612-1676) *Ausführliche Arbeit von der Teutschen Hauptsprache* (1663). However this may be, for almost a century "gehörte sie (sc. Moonen's work) zu den tonangebendsten Sprachlernern des Niederländischen" (Schaars 1988: 375).

addition to that I would like to point out that in doing so he followed a typically Dutch tradition which had existed for more than a century. For it is clear that, as early as the second part of the seventeenth century, Dutch scientists felt attracted to experimental research. The experimental method, "insbesondere in der strenge methodischen Durchbearbeitung, die Newtons Grundgedanken bei den *holländischen* Denkern und Naturforschern gefunden hatten" (Cassirer 1932: 79), resulted in empiricism, which was propagated in the eighteenth century by leading Dutch physicists, such as Hermannus Boerhaave (1668-1738) and Willem Jacob 's-Gravesande (1688-1742), a friend of Newton's. The ideas of these Dutch scientists were influential abroad, as well as beyond the confines of their own field of research. In particular, they had a fundamental influence upon the French Enlightenment.⁹

In Dutch linguistics the influence of this empirical trend can be found, among other things, in the works of the eighteenth-century 'Schola Hemsterhusiana', a group of Dutch classical scholars which consisted of the Greek scholar Tiberius Hemsterhuis (1685-1766) and some of his pupils who shared a number of ideas and methods regarding the study of Greek.¹⁰ What is of special interest is the way they interpreted the concept of analogy, a concept that played an important methodological role in the scientific approach propagated by 's Gravesande and others Dutch scientists. The thesis defended by Gerretzen (1940) is that the basic views of the Schola Hemsterhusiana took shape under the direct influence of the basic views prevalent in philosophy and natural philosophy at that time. For example, Hemsterhuis, who for that matter was acquainted with the ideas of John Locke, considered language to be an ideally built body, and like an anatomist he wished to dissect the *corpus linguae*, as he called it, attempting to know it in even its minutest parts. A similar [103] attitude of mind has been pointed at in the works of the Dutch Arabist and Orientalist Albert Schultens (1686-1750). What is more, it is interesting to see that the Hemsterhuisian Everard Scheidius (1742-1795) pointed at the link with another area of linguistics too, thus stressing the unity of method in those various fields, when he remarked: "veras etymologiae rationes, hoc ipso demum ineunte saeculo, in Graecis reperit T. Hemsterhusius, in Orientalibus A. Schultensius, in Batavis L. ten Kate" (Gerretzen 1940: 112).

As we know, Lambert ten Kate (1674-1731), the historical linguist, was lavishly praised by nineteenth-century Dutch linguistic scholars because of his strict adherence to empirical principles in linguistics. He shows all the characteristics of the 'Universalgelehrte'. As Peeters (1990: 153) emphasized, ten Kate sought to find the regularities proceeding from the phenomenona with the help of reason. It has been argued that it was the empirico-rationalism of Boerhaave's medicine that formed the background of Ten Kate's physics (Jongeneelen 1992: 210). Around 1800, leading Dutch prescriptive grammarians, such as Weiland and Siegenbeek stated how much they were indebted to the "immortal" Ten Kate, and even Bilderdijk, who publicly always referred to Ten Kate with much disapproval, borrowed a lot from him.

Thus, in eighteenth-century Holland a tradition of empiricism can be discerned. As far as

⁹ In the second part of his *Les physiciens hollandais et la méthode expérimentale en France au XVIIIe siècle*, entitled "L'influence en France de la physique expérimentale hollandaise au XVIIIe siècle", Brunet showed convincingly "comment la pensée et l'enseignement des professeurs des universités hollandaises ont été féconds" in France (Brunet 1926: 30)

¹⁰ Hemsterhuis and his followers Lodewijk Caspar Valckenaer (1715-1785), Johannes Daniel van Lennep (1724-1771) and Everard Scheidius (1742-1795) developed an etymological examination of language which sets out to work on a reconstructive basis. In this connection, it is remarkable that the major figures of this school, Hemsterhuis and Valckenaer, although they pronounced and applied their fundamental ideas in their lectures, devoted no general publications to them. As Holland was an international breeding ground for philologists, their views were disseminated through the lecture notes made by their students to Germany, France, England, and even to Transsylvania. It was Scheidius who made these views public by publishing what we would call a standard edition of van Lennep's lecture notes *De Analogia Linguae Graecae* in 1790 (Verburg 1952: 428). Note that as early as 1778 and 1779 a more obscure edition of van Lennep's lecture notes had been published in Utrecht and London.

the major areas of language study are concerned, this approach might be characterized as 'inductive rationalism' or, to use the term Verburg introduced in his *Taal en Functionaliteit* ('Language and its Functions'), 'pragmatic rationalism' (Verburg 1952: 431-434; cf. also Peeters 1990: 155), which is opposed to 'scientific' or 'axiomatic' rationalism.

I think this empiricist influx into Dutch linguistics may explain (in part) why, unlike Weiß's description of the trend in Germany, the Netherlands saw so few linguists tackle the field of general grammar, either using Cartesian methods or a deductive approach based on such views as those of the German philosopher Christian Wolff (1679-1754). In discussing the eighteenth-century my former supervisor, the late Dick Bakker (1934-1985), summarized eighteenth-century views on language as follows: "Language has a certain logic, insofar it shows a logical coherence which can be discovered inductively (Schola Hemsterhusiana) or deductively (philosophical grammar)" (Bakker 1977: 116). It appears that from the late seventeenth century on the Dutch linguists preferred the inductive method.

2. The nineteenth century: the German turn

2.1. Introduction

In the history of Dutch language research in the first half of the nineteenth century one can distinguish three research traditions: prescriptive or normative grammar as it was practised, for example, by the followers of J.C. Adelung; historical grammar, introduced into the study of Dutch by Matthias de Vries; [104] and general grammar, of which Taco Roorda can be seen as a leading representative. Prescriptive grammar was influenced considerably by Adelung. As I mentioned before, it was at the behest of the government of the Batavian Republic that the Rotterdam minister Pieter Weiland wrote a *Nederduitsche Spraakkunst* (1805), and the Leiden professor Matthijs Siegenbeek (1774-1854) - the very first official professor of Dutch language - devised a Dutch spelling system in 1804. Both refer to Adelung repeatedly. Numerous schoolbooks and textbooks, both in the Netherlands and abroad, were based to a large degree on the *Nederduitsche Spraakkunst*.

The influence of the French *grammaire générale*-tradition is conspicuous by its absence. It can only be found in a reduced form in various textbooks used in primary and secondary schools. For example, the *Leçons d'Analyse logique* (1827, 1890³⁶) by F.J.M. Noël and Ch. P. Chapsal were frequently used in Holland, as well as the works by C.C. Le Tellier. We know that at Leiden grammar school Charles-Pierre Duvivier's *Grammaire des grammaires* (1811, 1842¹¹) was used as a textbook. General grammar was not represented at university level until the early 1850's (cf. van Driel 1988: 170-174). In Belgium, for a short time the southern part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the method of the "M.M. de Port-Royal" was applied by the Luxembourger abbé Philippe Olinger (1794-1873) in his book *La Langue Hollandoise* (1821). His references are to Du Marsais and Beauzée.

Be this as it may, German was considered to be a language much superior to French, which according to Dutch linguists was more or less a dead language. Thus, as I said before, Germany was to provide the great example now, both for linguists and philosophers.

2.2. Johannes Kinker

One of those philosophers was Johannes Kinker (1764-1845), a lawyer who for some time was professor of Dutch language and literature in Liège (1817-1830), but who was first and foremost a philosopher, being one of the first disciples of Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) in the Low Countries. After reading Kant's *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* three times he was of the opinion that he could fully comprehend the work of his German contemporary. Subsequently, he published a study on Kant's first *Kritik* in 1799, which appeared in French under the title *Essai d'une exposition succinte de la Critique de la Critique de la Raison-Pure* (Amsterdam 1801). Thus, Kinker's work could serve as one of the sources for the study of Kant both in

France (and in England).¹¹ [105]

Kinker never wrote a grammar, but he did publish on grammatical issues several times, although his primary interest was in the philosophy of language. In his *Inleiding eener wijsgeerige algemeene theorie der talen* ('Introduction to a Philosophical General Theory of Language', 1817), Kinker developed his own language theory, starting out from Kant's philosophy. On the basis of a Kantian analysis of thinking, Kinker showed how 'thought language', the ideal language, is structured. His aim was to give an image of 'thought language', not an empirical description of one of the spoken languages he was acquainted with.¹²

It is clear that the main source of inspiration for Kinker was not the work of, for instance, the French Idéologues, but the philosophical system of Immanuel Kant. Other influences do not seem to have played a more than marginal role, although we know that Kinker was also acquainted with the works of French authors such as Restaut, Estarac, Destutt de Tracy, Frain du Tremblay and others (cf. van der Wal 1977: 56).¹³ For instance, in his 'Introduction' Kinker argues against Condillac and Destutt de Tracy disputing the widely accepted opinion that the verb *être* serves as the basis of all other verbs. Kinker rejects the analysis given in Destutt de Tracy's (1754-1836) *Éléments d'idéologie* (1801-1815) and replaces it by his own analysis.

Kinker worked out his Kantian language theory independently, he said, and his Dutch contemporaries regarded his essay as very difficult, but also as new and original. This may now sound strange to us, for we know that several more works in the Kantian mould were written in Germany before and after the turn of the century. At any rate, Kinker's *Introduction*, although not completely forgotten in later years - after all, he was a well-known man of letters -, attracted hardly any followers (van der Wal 1977: 62-63; cf. also van Driel 1988: 192-193). In the 1860s his work was explicitly looked upon as belonging to a closed era.

In 1833, Kinker published another work, an essay concerning the use of empirical knowledge of language for philosophy ("Wat nut kan de empirische algemeene taalkennis aan de hogere wijsbegeerte toebrengen?"). The Dutch linguist and philosopher Hendrik J. Pos (1898-1955), well acquainted with [106] French philosophical thought, noticed some influence from the German philosopher Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762-1814) on this essay, remarking that this work was an illustration of "germanic thinking". And to my mind this characterization also applies to other works in the tradition of general grammar that appeared

¹¹ F. Azouvi & Dominique Bourel, *De Königsberg à Paris. La réception de Kant en France (1788-1804)* (Paris 1991) do mention the fact that Destutt de Tracy was familiar with this work by "ce professeur Batave" (p. 185). In his own country, Kinker defended Kant in the battle for and against the Königsberg philosopher that was going on in the Netherlands around the turn of the century. In later years distancing himself somewhat from Kantian philosophy, he strived to improve upon Kant's work by completing it in his essay on *Le Dualisme de la Raison humaine; ou le criticisme de Em. Kant, améliorisé sous le rapport de la raison pure, et rendu complet sous celui de la raison pratique*, published posthumously in 1850-52 in Amsterdam.

¹² In his unpublished *Lectures on General Linguistics* (1924-1932) the Dutch linguist Hendrik J. Pos defended Kinker against the criticism on the part of the empiricist minded philosopher B.H.C.K. van der Wijck (1836-1925), who in his book on Kinker had raised objections against the universal aspects in Kinker's approach. Kinker based himself solely on the languages he was acquainted with himself (cf. van der Wal 1977: 39-41), Van der Wijck argued. Pos noted that "such objections usually are raised by those empiristic scholars who are satisfied with the research of one particular field and who not only refuse to be concerned about the apriori, the universal aspects, but also discredit them when other scholars dare to be concerned about them".

¹³ My browsing through several of Kinker's lecture notes and other manuscripts such as the *Principes métaphysiques des langues, ou de grammaire générale*, which can be consulted at the University Library of Leiden, did not yield any results that could alter this picture.

in Holland in the second half of the nineteenth century.¹⁴

It has been remarked that with Kinker's attempts to explain the general laws of language on the basis of the Kantian general laws of thinking "the era of logical language study" in the Netherlands had come to a close "with dignity". After Kinker the study of general grammar (Roorda, te Winkel, cf. section 2.4) was to be cast in a different mould. It became psychological, and language forms were increasingly taken into account.

2.3. School grammar and 'logical analysis'

The nineteenth-century Dutch school grammar which develops the notion of 'logical analysis' can be considered both as a continuation and a reduction of general grammar, incorporating the normative approach to language. It is in this field too that we can point to a 'German turn'.

In 1814, the schoolmaster Nicolaas Anslin Nz. (1777-1838) published a *Nederduitsche Spraakkunst voor eerstbeginnenden* ('Dutch grammar for beginners'). This book is the first Dutch school grammar in which the sentence is taken as a starting-point: the opening chapters are devoted to the analysis of sentences. From other works Anslin published in the field of language teaching we know that he was influenced by the work of Johann Christian Dolz (1769-1843), a German 'Volksschullehrer'. When translating Dolz's concise logic into Dutch, Anslin arrived at the conclusion that sentence analysis ought to be the basis of language teaching, especially when parts of speech are concerned. Dolz, however, was not his sole source. For didactic purposes, Anslin developed his own model of sentence analysis. To this end, he borrowed not only from Adelung and his Dutch disciple Weiland, but in the essays he published during the 1830s we also find a reference to Sicard. This means that Anslin, obviously an eclectic, is also directly connected with the tradition of the *grammaire générale*.

In the wake of Anslin and Dolz we find in J.C. Beijer's (1786-after 1839) *Handleiding tot den Nederlandschen stijl* ('Handbook of Dutch stylistics', 1820) a section on the 'proposition' and its analysis. De Vooys (1952: 157) calls this 'logical basis' "typically eighteenth-century" French influence. Among his sources are Du Marsais and Thiébauld. Another follower of Anslin is J. van Schreven (1791-1859), a schoolmaster whose *Korte handleiding tot het redekundig ontleden van voorstellen en volzinnen* ('Concise handbook for the logical analysis of propositions and periods'; 1832¹, 1865²) contains an elaboration and refinement on certain points, going beyond the elementary [107] model put forward by Anslin. It became rather popular among primary school teachers.

In his review of the third edition (1844) of this handbook Arie de Jager (1806-1877), well-known in the field of language teaching, gave high praise to van Schreven because the latter had pursued his own line of thought, and had not chosen the new trend in language teaching, the "wrong school in linguistics", which had come from the other side of the German border. What de Jager was referring to were the works of Becker and Wurst. In a previous essay of 1842, de Jager had remarked that the relative uniformity of Dutch books on sentence analysis had been broken down by the introduction of books based on the "abstract-systematizing" method of K.F. Becker (1775-1849) and Raimund Jakob Wurst (1800-1845). One of the proponents of this 'wrong trend' was B. Brugsma, who subsequently received a lot of criticism from de Jager.

In 1840, the Groningen schoolmaster Berend Brugsma (1797-1868), who was well acquainted with developments in education in Germany, published his *Nederduitsche taalkunde*, a book which was intended for schoolmasters and the pupils in the senior forms of primary school. In his foreword, Brugsma wrote that he had followed the ideas of Karl Ferdinand Becker in general, and that he had "consulted" Wurst's *Praktische Sprachdenklehre*. Upon closer inspection, it becomes clear that Brugsma's book is just a Dutch adaptation of Raimund Jakob Wurst's *Praktische Sprachdenklehre* (1836), which was quite popular in those days. Elsewhere, Brugsma published a number of essays on first

¹⁴ As a matter of fact, Pos considered K.F. Becker's *Organism der Sprache* (1827¹) to be "the German counterpart of Kinker's philosophy of language".

language teaching which drew heavily on Wurst's *Theoretisch-praktische Anleitung zum Gebrauche der Sprachdenklehre* (1836-38). In these essays he argued in favour of the ideas of Becker and Wurst. Thus, it can be concluded that in the Netherlands it was only in the second half of the 1830s that Becker's ideas were propagated - and debated - for the first time (cf. van Driel 1989).

The ongoing influence of Becker can easily be demonstrated at the works of another schoolmaster and prolific author, Gerrit Christiaan Mulder (1810-1859). His *Nieuwe Nederlandsche Spraakkunst* (1846) is a voluminous, traditionally-organized grammar, in which one finds references not only to well-known Dutch authors, but also to Heyse and Noël & Chapsal. In a contemporary review Mulder's *Nederlandsche Spraakkunst voor schoolgebruik* (1847), which is structured in a different way, is even hailed as the Dutch counterpart to J.C.A. Heyse and to Noël & Chapsal. It starts with a brief chapter on analysis.

In another grammar, his extensive *Nederlandsche Spraakleer* of 1852, Mulder referred explicitly to "the great linguist" K.F. Becker, whose views are incorporated partially in the syntactic part of the book. The *Theoretisch-praktische deutsche Grammatik* by Heyse père et fils was probably another important source. In the fifth edition of the *Nederlandsche Spraakkunst voor schoolgebruik* (1854) Mulder presented a complete revision of the syntactic part of this book. This "Syntax of the Dutch language", which appeared also in the form of a booklet, had now been fully rewritten in a Beckerian vein. [108]

2.4. General grammar in the 1850s and 1860s: conflicts and borderlines

Up to 1852, only a relatively small number of school books on logical analysis appeared, and they were mainly based on or adapted from French and German school grammars. The first in the Netherlands to practise logical analysis on a truly scholarly level was Taco Roorda. As his contemporary and opponent Lammert A. te Winkel put it, Roorda's *Over de deelen der rede* (1852) was the first specimen of a scholarly treatment of logical analysis, a field which was generally regarded as a "most difficult part of grammar" (te Winkel 1859: 7).

Taco Roorda (1801-1874), professor of Javanese at the Institution for the Teaching of Linguistics, Geography and Ethnography of the Dutch East Indies at Delft, a college for the training of Dutch colonial civil servants, can be regarded as one of the most prominent nineteenth-century representatives of the tradition of general grammar in the Netherlands. A theologian by education, he showed a keen interest in philosophy, and in the field of linguistics he had developed into an expert on several non-Indo-European languages (Hebrew, Arabic, Javanese). The year 1855 saw the publication of Roorda's *Javaansche Grammatica* ('Javanese Grammar'), which was "by 19th-century standards a first-rate and original work and exerted a wide influence on Indonesian linguistic studies" (Uhlenbeck 1964: 50). When studying Javanese he did not opt for a historical-comparative approach, but preferred working along the lines of the general linguistic theory he had expounded in his *Over de deelen der rede en de rede-ontleding* ('On the Parts of Speech and on speech-analysis'; 1852, 1855², 1864³), a book devoted to 'logical analysis' (from *logos*, 'word', 'speech', not from *logic*) which was meant to serve as a "basis for the scientific study of language". In this connection, I would like to stress that in Roorda's view 'logical analysis' is not restricted to sentence analysis; it comprises a full linguistic analysis, including morphology.

To illustrate Roorda's central viewpoints in this respect a brief quotation from the introduction of Roorda's *Javaansche Grammatica* must suffice here:

A true insight into and clear discernment of the meaning of the grammatical ways of expression in the Javanese language can only be obtained by tracing that logical element which is the only truly universal, which is the same in all languages, but which is expressed in the most different ways in the various language families, and in those again differently in every language branch and in every individual language (Roorda 1855: v-vii).

In the introduction to his *Over de deelen der rede*, Roorda complained that the science which

treats the general foundations of grammar upon which the grammar of each individual language has to be built, viz. the 'logical analysis of language', had yet to be established, meaning that it had no firm place among the other sciences. According to Roorda that had to do with the poor 'state of the art'. He acknowledged that much work has been done in the first half of the century, but he remarked at the same time that even the best and most thorough book on the subject, namely Becker's *Organism der Sprache* (²1841), had too many shortcomings (Roorda 1852: vi). Thus, in his own book Roorda tried to [109] improve upon the work of Becker. A detailed comparison between Roorda and Becker (van Driel 1988) shows that Roorda's views resemble Becker's, but that there are also considerable differences between them: for instance, with Roorda the 'logos' concept is dominant and he has a keener eye for the characteristics of linguistic forms. Roorda's logical analysis with its emphasis on language as a vehicle for thought fits into the Humboldtian-Kantian view of language. Apparently there were hardly any relations with French linguists (cf. van Driel 1988: 247 ff., 369-370). To be sure, Roorda's essay on general linguistics, which has various idiosyncratic features, is a most interesting book, but I cannot enter into a detailed discussion of *Over de deelen der rede* here. For details, I would like to refer to the excellent study by van Driel (1988, cf. also van Driel 1992: 236-239).

In the 1850s, Roorda's views on language brought him into conflict with proponents of the historical school in Dutch linguistics. In 1855, Roorda delivered a lecture in the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences in which he proposed a reform of the written language geared to the spoken language. His proposals to change Dutch spelling immediately provoked sharp criticism from more traditionally-minded scholars, his principal opponent being Matthias de Vries (1820-1892), who had been appointed professor of Dutch language at the University of Leiden in 1853, and who was a devoted follower of Jacob Grimm, but not first and foremost a theorist. At first sight, this debate seems to dwell upon matters of spelling, but in fact it was more than this. It was a clash between two different views on language and linguistics, a historical and inductive one, and a more or less 'synchronic' and deductive approach. Roorda's references are to Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767-1835), Heymann Steinthal (1823-1899), and Karl Wilhelm Ludwig Heyse (1797- 1855), whereas de Vries felt inspired by Jacob Grimm and August Schleicher (1821-1868). A few years earlier de Vries had made his views public concerning what was the "wahre Wissenschaft", namely "the historical study of the living language". In this he followed Grimm, who had argued that the structure of the living language could only be explained historically, "nur geschichtlich". De Vries propagated a strict, inductive method taking its cues from the natural sciences, for language, too, was a part of nature, and therefore the linguist should conform to the canons of the prestigious natural sciences. The methodological guidelines to be followed were those of unprejudiced observation, without any *a priori*.

The major issue in the discussion then was the fact that Roorda did not show himself to be particularly interested in the historical development of a language, preferring to study a language as it was "at a certain moment"; he mainly considered language as "Etwas von heute" (Grimm), having the ability to look at the facts of a language "without any historical bias and with a remarkable insight in the synchronic reality of a language" (Uhlenbeck 1964: 52). It has been remarked that the main body of Roorda's *Javaansche Grammatica* (1855) was "purely descriptive and synchronic in character" (Teeuw 1971: xxvi).

Note, however, that de Vries, who was engaged in raising the study of the mother tongue to what he considered to be a really 'scientific' level, contented [110] himself with a rather defensive approach. He launched a harsh attack on Roorda's unorthodox views concerning the interpretation of the data of the older stages of Dutch. As it happens, Roorda had argued that inflexion as used in written Dutch was not authentic, but artificial or imported from Germany. However, he had interpreted the facts incorrectly, and, quite obviously, de Vries felt compelled to defend his newly-found territory. What strikes me in this connection is the fact that he did not call into question the validity of Roorda's 'logical' approach in the field of Javanese studies, nor did he turn against Roorda's *Over de deelen der rede*, at least not in writing.

Roorda's *Over de deelen der rede* was severely criticized by Lammert A. te Winkel (1809-1868), who was working together with de Vries on the *Woordenboek der Nederlandse Taal*

('Dictionary of the Dutch Language') and who was an expert in historical grammar. In contrast, however, with his Leiden friend de Vries, te Winkel was very interested in what we would call general linguistics. In his 1858 and 1859 monographs on 'Logical Analysis', he launched an attack on Roorda's theory, which he essentially equated with Becker's. In his extensive response to *Over de deelen der rede* and in his numerous papers published in the periodical *De Taalgids* ('The Language Guide') he followed the lead of Steinthal's *Grammatik, Logik und Psychologie* (1855), discussing at length problems concerning the foundations of linguistics and questions of a general linguistic nature. Due to his untimely death te Winkel did not succeed in finishing either the comprehensive grammar or the related style guide he had intended to write, but his inspiring reflections on language and the study of language have had a considerable impact, in particular in the field of Dutch school grammar (cf. van Driel 1988). *De Taalgids* (1859-1867), which was dominated by te Winkel, played a crucial role in this.

At any rate, I would like to emphasize that around 1860, Te Winkel accepted the importance of logical analysis. However, he did not appreciate the way Roorda worked out his ideas on that subject. Te Winkel saw too much logic, too much Becker, in Roorda's book, and having read Steinthal's *Grammatik, Logik und Psychologie* (1856) he did not hesitate to tackle Roorda with the support of Steinthal's psychological theories. He sought to correct Roorda's views, by reducing Roorda's essentially metaphysical view of language to matters of form or meaning.

It is evident that Te Winkel regarded logical analysis as part of general grammar (cf. te Winkel 1858: 10). Without any reservations concerning its scientific status te Winkel discussed questions like: what is general grammar? What is its objective and its relation to special grammar? In other words: in the 1850s and 1860s general grammar was anything but dead for him. It appears that te Winkel saw no incompatibility between his studies in the field of general grammar and his activities in the field of historical linguistics. Like Roorda, he was highly interested in theoretical problems and he, too, regarded a non-historical approach as methodologically valid. Te Winkel held the opinion that comparative historical grammar did not encompass the whole study of language. And in the same vein as the American scholar William Dwight Whitney (1827-1894) [111] several years later (cf. Whitney 1875: 318-319), te Winkel (1860: 171) noted that the substantial growth of comparative historical grammar had been at the expense of the development of a real "science of language", and in the 1860s he did his best to contribute to the development of that very science of language.

Roorda's *Javanese Grammar* put the study of Javanese on a scientific basis and exerted a wide influence on Indonesian linguistics. Several grammars not only of Javanese but also of other Indonesian languages were modelled after it (Uhlenbeck 1964: 50; cf. van Driel 1988: 278). However, in the 1860s Roorda's views on language provoked another discussion, this time in the very field of the study of Indonesian languages. This time Roorda had to cross swords with Herman Neubronner van der Tuuk (1824-1894), a doctor honoris causa of Utrecht University, who had been sent by the Dutch Bible Society to Sumatra to study the Toba Batak language. After many years in the colonies, he returned to the Netherlands working out his notes gathered in Sumatra and preparing his grammar (1858-1868). Van der Tuuk can be characterized as and adherent of determinism and a hard-boiled positivist.

From the brochures van der Tuuk published around the mid 1860s, it becomes abundantly clear that this field linguist was by no means ready to subscribe to Roorda's linguistic views or to accept Roorda's Javanese grammar as a model for the description of other Indonesian languages (Uhlenbeck 1964: 51). The basis of the severe clash which ensued between these two linguists (cf. van Driel 1984) lay in the fact that van der Tuuk followed the methods of historical-comparative trend - his approach has been characterized as typically *pre-junggrammatisch*. One can understand a language solely "the historical way", van der Tuuk argued. He rejected once and for all Roorda's "philosophical" approach: the history of the study of language shows that one cannot penetrate deeply into a language with the help of a philosophical method. Van der Tuuk's heroes were Franz Bopp (1791-1867) and Jacob Grimm, whereas Wilhelm von Humboldt was considered to be merely "a dabbler in linguistics". His sources included the works of August Schleicher and Max Müller

(1823-1900).

I would like to emphasize that van der Tuuk's polemic against Roorda was the one and only time that the latter's theoretical approach in linguistics was brought under discussion from outside, i.e. from another linguistic 'paradigm'. In hindsight one can hardly say that the Roorda-van der Tuuk controversy has resulted in a fruitful exchange of theoretical views: the discussion was too much marred by strong personal notes. Roorda further fully concentrated on preparing a new Javanese dictionary; he died in 1873. Van der Tuuk left for the Dutch East Indies in 1868 and he was never to see his fatherland again.

My conclusion is that the 1850s and 1860s were an important period in the development of linguistics in the Netherlands. Historical linguistics gained a footing in the academic curriculum, and the same decade saw a flourishing (by Dutch standards, at least) of general grammar which would last for some fifteen years. Roorda's *Over de deelen der rede* of 1852, which was reprinted twice (in 1855 and 1864), had a few loyal followers. Te Winkel published two critical [112] monographs (1858, 1859), and dozens of articles in which he tried to amend Roorda's views. In the field of school grammar te Winkel's publications had a lot of influence. These activities are rather striking when we take into consideration the global image of nineteenth-century linguistics being dominated by a historical and comparative approach. It is interesting to note that in the Netherlands only the mid-1860s witnessed a fundamental and explicit criticism of general grammar as such. However, the severe criticism of Roorda's linguistic views by empiricist scholars such as de Vries and van der Tuuk had a devastating effect. 'Logical analysis' became discredited as a serious approach to linguistics.

2.5. School grammar in the last decades of the nineteenth century

The tradition of general grammar as supported by Roorda and te Winkel was not developed further within scholarly circles. It was mainly in school grammar that this tradition was continued. This becomes evident, for instance, in the works of Dirk de Groot (1825-1895), an instructor and later a principal of a teacher training college. De Groot published a *Nederlandsche Spraakleer* (1868), which he dedicated to his eminent colleague Brugsma (see 2.3). In his foreword de Groot referred approvingly to Becker, and it appears that in certain respects he took over a number of syntactic categories from the Becker school (cf. le Loux-Schuringa 1985: 88-95). His *Nederlandsche Spraakkunst* of 1872, which ran through many editions, was influenced to an significant extent by the works of Becker and Wurst, as can be deduced from the analytic set-up of this grammar and de Groot's adoption of the various 'logical relations' as developed in Becker's work (for details, see Hulshof 1985).

However popular de Groot's grammar may have been – its ninth and last edition appeared in 1888 –, it was soon superseded by what has become a classical work in Dutch linguistics, viz. Cornelis Herman den Hertog's (1846-1902) three-volume *Nederlandsche Spraakkunst* (1892-1896, 1902-1904²), a broadly-framed grammar, meant for student teachers. This grammar demonstrates that Becker's influence on school grammar could still be felt in the 1890s, but it is certain that other trends also played their part in den Hertog's work. It is interesting to see what sources were mentioned. In the first volume, in which sentence analysis was treated, Den Hertog discussed three trends in linguistics: the logical trend, the psychological-historical trend and the morphological one, of which the respective representatives were Karl Ferdinand Becker, Hermann Paul (1846-1921) and Franz Kern (1830-1894). In general, Becker's approach is too abstract for use in schools, den Hertog remarked, but one should not abandon it completely. The historical view cannot be used for didactic reasons however instructive it may be to remind us of the fact that language is constantly changing. Kern's definition of the sentence - the *verbum finitum* as its centre - was welcomed as a step forward. But to regard grammar as exclusively *Formenlehre* à la Kern is too formal an approach, Den Hertog warned his readers, as this approach gave priority to something constantly [113] changing such as form, and not to the "immutable meanings" of the parts of the sentence, which were - and this is a telling statement, I think - "identical in all languages". All in all, for school grammar den Hertog preferred a sensible fusion of Becker

and Kern, although I think he had set his heart on Becker's system, following it in general lines where sentence analysis is concerned. The sentence parts are defined in semantic terms, the formal aspects providing the restrictions of this approach. Den Hertog was a man of compromise, but also an observer and analyst of the first order. An eclectic, he created a frame work in which elements from heterogenous sources were united into a new and cohesive whole: notions from general grammar merged with notions borrowed from traditional 'partes' grammar and historical grammar. His grammatical works have remained a real Fundgrube for Dutch linguists up to the present time. His *Spraakkunst* was reprinted several times in the 1970s, in the very period that generative grammar got a firm foothold at Dutch universities.

3. The last phase of general grammar in the Netherlands

In the last two decades of the nineteenth century the classical scholar and "privaat-docent" Jan Marius Hoogvliet (1860-1924) developed an individual approach to non-historical linguistics, in which he sought to take into account data from non-Indo-European languages. In 1903, his major work appeared, *Lingua*, a handbook of general linguistic knowledge, which he claimed to be a highly original contribution to linguistic theory. In 1895, Hoogvliet published part of this handbook in a preliminary version to gain financial support for the publication of the entire work. The title of this brochure was *Grondbeginselen der Algemeene of Univerzele spraakleer* ('Principles of general or universal grammar'). Twenty-five different languages formed the basis of his research and he hoped, within some fifteen to twenty years, to also include "ways of talking of the *uncivilized* nations" in his "general scheme of language". The *Grondbeginselen* in its final form would be complemented by "eight *concentrated grammars* of *selected* languages", each with a length of some twenty-five to forty pages. The principal rules of the grammars of each of these languages would be "outlined concisely and clearly in a *single terminology*, according to *one stable system of order* in complete accordance with the principles developed in the body of the book" (Hoogvliet 1895: 4). His 1903 *Lingua* can best be characterized as a specimen of universal grammar with psychological underpinnings; it was intended as a grammar for all languages of the world and should be related to the concise grammars of various languages which Hoogvliet wrote beginning in the late 1880s. This procedure is reminiscent of the various *Méthodes* written by the Port-Royal grammarians (cf. Noordegraaf 1992 for details).¹⁵ [114]

The universal, logical classification of the parts of speech expounded in *Lingua* must be seen as a direct reaction to Hermann Paul's (1846-1921) *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte* (1880). Moreover, Hoogvliet defended the scientific character of a non-historical approach of language against Paul. In this, he is the most remarkable Dutch synchronic linguist of the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Hoogvliet's work was associated by contemporary critics with eighteenth-century *grammaire générale*, and in the days of Wundt and van Ginneken that was hardly a recommendation. Hoogvliet's plea for a return to logic, away from psychology,¹⁶ met with severe criticism. In those heydays of historical-comparative linguistics his work attracted hardly any followers.

The linguist, poet and philosopher Johan Andreas Dèr Mouw (1863-1919) had devoted a whole book to Hoogvliet's linguistic method as early as 1900, because he was of the opinion

¹⁵ The broad empirical foundation of *Lingua* brought one of Hoogvliet's critics, Joseph Golling, to the statement that "dass eine Universalgrammatik auf solch breiter Grundlage wie die vorliegende noch nicht unternommen wurde und diese daher das nicht ganz unberechtigte Misstrauen, das man bisher solchen Arbeiten entgegengebracht hat, wohl zu erschüttern geeignet ist" (Golling 1904:1008).

¹⁶ As Hoogvliet put it himself in 1913: "Der Kern des Sprachwesens ist also *kein* psychologischer sondern ein *logischer*, aber die *Logik der menschlichen Sprache* ist *nicht* die Aristotelische, nicht die Kantische, die Hegelsche [...] Logik, sondern eine viel einfachere in unterbewusster Form in *allen* menschlichen Individuen befindliche *Normallogik*, welche ich in meiner Universalgrammatik *Lingua* darzulegen versucht habe" (cf. Noordegraaf 1992:294).

that Hoogvliet's theoretical-scientific views were an effective means to reform the teachings of the classical languages, which at the time were in a crisis-like situation. Moreover, he sincerely believed in the feasibility of such a general grammar, which should precede every special grammar. However, Dèr Mouw was one of the few who took Hoogvliet's views seriously (Fresco 1987), and he was the only one who made a comprehensive attempt to defend them (Dèr Mouw 1900). To the publication of *Lingua* he reacted with an extensive review (Dèr Mouw 1903), which he eventually decided not to publish. Although he praised Hoogvliet calling him a genius and an original thinker in the concluding paragraph, he also expressed sharp criticism.

The most extensive and devastating reaction came from Jac. van Ginneken (1877-1945), whose at the time well-known *Principes de linguistique psychologique* (1907) should be regarded as a direct elaboration of his *Lingua* review of 1903 (cf. van Groenendaal 1903). The *Principes* can be seen as an attempt to surpass not only Wundt, but also Hoogvliet. Just like Hoogvliet, he wanted to introduce a new kind of linguistics in addition to, as well as in contrast to, to historical linguistics, presenting his book as an "essai synthétique". I think one could argue that van Ginneken's practising of what he called "linguistique générale" was based on a *rapprochement* between a superior (psychological) theory and a "flowering richness" of variegated facts – "Allgemeine Grammatik in neuer Form" (Naumann)?¹⁷ [115]

In 1928, the year when the First International Congress of Linguists took place in The Hague, Jacob Hessing (1874-1944), Special Professor of Philosophy at Leiden University and an ardent follower of the notorious Dutch Hegelian, professor Gerardus J.P.J. Bolland (1854-1922), published a "Proeve eener voorbereiding tot wijsgeerige spraakleer" ('Preparatory specimen of a philosophical grammar'). His reflections were written down in a Hegelian spirit. Suffice it to say that professional Dutch linguists were too occupied with other things to pay any serious attention to an obscure essay on "philosophical grammar".

In the early 1930s voices were heard within the circles of professional language teachers propagating a 'universal grammatical course', which was to be based on Latin. These suggestions, however, were forcefully rejected by coming men such as Martinus Jan Langeveld (1905-1989) and Anton J. B. N. Reichling (1898-1896). Their point of view was rather different indeed. As they saw it, it was the mother tongue that had to play a pivotal role in language teaching and language learning.¹⁸ All in all, it appears that their arguments were effective, for to my knowledge such a 'universal' course never got off the ground.

4. Final remarks

Throughout his unpublished *Lectures on General Linguistics* (1924-1932), Hendrik J. Pos, a trained classical philologist who was appointed professor of general linguistics at the Amsterdam Vrije Universiteit in 1924, paid serious attention to various representatives of general grammar (cf. Noordegraaf 1991). Among other things, he turned against the dictum of Theodor Benfey (1809-1881) in his *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* of 1869 that in the course of the nineteenth century all philosophy in linguistics had given way under the increasing pressure of the empirical study of language. "The nineteenth century is surely more complicated than that it can be characterized by only one feature", Pos argued, and he remarked that even in that Golden Age of historical linguistics general grammar continued to produce all sorts of works. In other words, Pos emphasized the continuing of general

¹⁷ Van Ginneken's attempt at capturing linguistic changes in the laws of psychological automatism "muss aber [...] auf Ablehnung stossen", according to Delbrück (1919:151), who compared van Ginneken's psychological categories with the Kantian categories applied to language by Gottfried Hermann (1772-1848) in the early nineteenth century.

¹⁸ Cf. M.J. Langeveld, *Taal en denken. Een theoretische en didactische bijdrage tot het onderwijs in de moedertaal op de middelbare school, inzonderheid tot dat der grammatika*. Groningen 1934, 27 note 1; A.J.B.N. Reichling, *Het Woord. Een studie omtrent de grondslag van taal en taalgebruik*. Nijmegen 1935, 'stelling' (proposition added to a doctoral dissertation) VIII.

grammar in the nineteenth century.¹⁹ I think the Dutch examples given in the present contribution prove that his assessment was right. In addition, it might be interesting to note [116] that Dutch linguists, too, discussed the foundations of linguistics and matters of a general linguistic nature. Among other things, inspired by Humboldtian thought, the idea of language as something comparable to a living organism was dismissed by them as early as the late 1850s, in other words before Michel Bréal (1832-1915) and other French scholars advanced their critique of this idea (cf. Aarsleff 1982). Thus, in this connection I would like to give my compatriots more credit than they have received as a result of their publishing in the language of a small nation. As regards these issues, we see that the study of the history of linguistics in a small country can open up unexpected vistas.

Second, the vicissitudes of general grammar in the Netherlands have been influenced by the developments in other sciences. The last quarter of the seventeenth century, which saw the failure of Nil Volentibus Arduum to produce its 'grammatica generalis', also saw a rapid decline of Cartesianism in Holland. Empiricism gained a firm foothold at Dutch universities in the first decades of the eighteenth century (Boerhaave, 's Gravesande). In 1732, it was remarked that "eo rem deduxisse ut qui inter germanos Cartesianos nomen suum profiteantur, vel duo sint vel nemo" (cf. Gerretzen 1940: 251). As can be gathered from the teachings of, among others, the members of the Schola Hemsterhusiana, empiricism left its marks on linguistic practice in an increasing degree. In the eighteenth century it resulted in what we have called inductive rationalism, which can be pointed out in the works of such contrasting scholars as Lambert ten Kate and Willem Bilderdijk. In the nineteenth century the empiristic trend turned into positivism, whose representatives in linguistics (de Vries, Van der Tuuk) did not approve of the views defended by an idealistic linguist such as Taco Roorda. At the beginnings of the twentieth century it was Jac. van Ginneken who deemed his 'linguistique psychologique' to be far superior to what he saw as the 'logical' approach put forward by Hoogvliet. Van Ginneken quoted more than 600 authors, seeking to ensure himself of an extraordinarily broad empirical basis. I think it is true to say that the long-standing empiristic tendency has blocked a large production of general grammars.

Finally, I would like to draw attention to a feature which characterizes much of the work done by the Dutch nineteenth-century general grammarians discussed above. Among most of them there seems to be no sense of being dependent upon their contemporary German colleagues or upon their Dutch predecessors. As I mentioned earlier, Kinker said he worked out his Kantian language theory independently, and he presented it as an original theory. And what about Roorda? As noted above, in the introduction to his *Over de deelen der rede* (1852), he complains that the science which treats the general foundations of grammar upon which the grammar of each individual language has to be built had yet to be established. What really strikes me in this connection is the fact that Roorda appears to deny the existence of a long standing tradition of general grammar. Never did he expatiate on that topic, and I can offer no satisfactory explanation for what seems to be ignorance on his part. At any rate, Roorda, like Kinker, claims that his ideas were original; however, his theory was so hard to [117] grasp that nobody has taken the trouble to compare it extensively with foreign models until quite recently (cf. van Driel 1988). And, in addition, I would like to emphasize that te Winkel seems to rely on his own strength, Steinthal's *Grammatik, Logik und Psychologie* of 1855 being his major guiding star.

The idea that he had done his work without referring to other linguists can also be found in Hoogvliet. It has always been his claim that he came to his theories at an early stage, and completely independently from anyone else. As a result, he was very annoyed by the attempts made by van Ginneken to trace back every remark and every idea that was offered in *Lingua* "to some German or other man of note as his property". In addition to historical-comparative linguistics, he wanted to introduce a "general anthropological-comparative study of

¹⁹ The same conclusion was reached by Auroux (1983: 12-13). In France, too, certain writers apparently saw no incompatibility between the programme of general grammar and the programme of historical-comparative grammar. As to the Netherlands, similar observations were made in Noordegraaf 1982.

language". His pursuit of this "new, entirely independent, original, non-German science of language", shows that he wanted to free linguistics from the "German slave yoke", as he put it.

Let us turn once more to den Hertog. His sole standard in accepting a particular theoretical view was its didactic practicability. For example, questions of the priority of form or meaning in grammatical definitions are, as far as den Hertog is concerned, didactic questions, not theoretical ones. It seemed no problem to him that the various notions used have their origin in mutually incompatible metatheories (Becker, Paul, Kern). Moreover, den Hertog's turn-of-the-century critics were not bothered by this either. Their major criticism is levelled at the normative slant of den Hertog's grammar. When characterizing his *Nederlandsche spraakkunst* as 'grammaire raisonnée', his contemporaries were only referring to his logical and normative bias, nothing more. Den Hertog was attacked not because he was a follower of Becker, but because of his conservative standpoint in the controversy about spoken and written language. The term 'general grammar' is used nowhere to characterize den Hertog's grammar as a whole.

I am well aware of the fact that claiming that one has conceived a completely novel theory is something like a topos in nineteenth-century general grammar, and that many a linguist considered himself as a great innovator. However, I think we may conclude that by working out their theories within a relatively independent framework, the Dutch linguists developed, by way of *aemulatio*, a 'local' variant of general grammar.²⁰ As always, the problem is to determine where exactly German influence ends and Dutch creativity begins. This is a good example of the "essential tension" (Kuhn) between what is original and what is adopted, which tension is intrinsic to much of the linguistic work done in the Netherlands. [118]

References

- Aarsleff, Hans
1982 From Locke to Saussure. Essays on the Study of Language and Intellectual History. London: Athlone.
- Auroux, Sylvain
1983 General Grammar and Universal Grammar in Enlightenment France. In: General Linguistics 23, 1-18.
- Bakker, Dirk Miente
1977 De grammatica in de negentiende eeuw. In: Bakker & Dibbets, 113-160.
- Bakker, Dirk Miente & Gerardus Rutgerus Wilhelmus Dibbets (eds.)
1977 Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse taalkunde. Den Bosch: Malmberg.
- Brunet, Pierre
1926 Les physiciens hollandais et la méthode expérimentale en France au XVIIIe siècle. Paris: Blanchard.
- Cassirer, Ernst
1932 Die Philosophie der Aufklärung. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.
- Dèr Mouw, Johan Andreas
1900 Dr. Hoogvliet's opvatting van taalstudie en methode van taalonderwijs. Amsterdam: S.L. van Looy, 1900. (Repr. in: Dèr Mouw, J.A., Verzamelde Werken. VI. Amsterdam: G.A. van Oorschot, 255-387).
1903 Review of Hoogvliet (1903). Unpubl. ms. (Printed in Noordegraaf 1987, 11-33).

²⁰ The question why many Dutch linguistics historiographers in the nineteenth and twentieth century seem to have ignored the existence of this trend in linguistics is discussed in Noordegraaf 1990.

- De Vos, Hendrik J.
1939 Moedertaalonderwijs in de Nederlanden. Een historisch-kritisch overzicht van de methoden bij de studie van de moedertaal in het middelbaar onderwijs sedert het begin van de 19e eeuw. Turnhout: Van Mierlo-Proost.
- Dibbets, Gerardus R.W.
1991 Vondels zoon en Vondels taal. Joannes Vollenhove en het Nederlands. Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek VU.
1994 Een nieuw spoor van de Port-Royalgrammatica in Nederland. In: Verslagen en mededelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Nederlandse taal- en letterkunde 1994, 250-278.
- Dongelmans, Berry Petrus Maria
1982 Nil Volentibus Arduum: Documenten en bronnen. Utrecht: HES Publishers.
- van Driel, Lodewijk Frans
1984 Roorda en de controverse met Van der Tuuk. In: Forum der Letteren 25, 275-291.
1988 De zin van de vorm. Roorda's logische analyse en de algemene grammatica. Amsterdam: VU-Uitgeverij.
1989 Becker in Holland. Some Remarks on the Reception of K.F. Becker's Organism-Theory in Dutch Linguistics. In: Dutz, Klaus D. (Ed.): Speculum historiographiae linguisticae. Kurzbeiträge der IV. Internationalen Konferenz zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaften. Münster: Nodus, 313-329.
1992 19th-Century Linguistics: The Dutch development and the German theme. In: Noordegraaf, Versteegh & Koerner, 221-251.
- van Driel, Lodewijk F. & Noordegraaf, Jan (eds.)
1982 Studies op het gebied van de geschiedenis van de taalkunde. Kloosterzande: Duerinck-Krachten.
- Fresco, Marcel F.
1987 Über das Verhältnis von Sprache, Denken und Welt. Ontologische Fragen unter besondere Berücksichtigung der Philosophie von J.A. dèr Mouw. In: de Rijk, L.M. & Braakhuis, H.A.G. (eds.): Logos and Pragma. Essays on the Philosophy of Language in Honour of Professor Gabriel Nuchelmans. Nijmegen: Ingenium Publishers, 259-280.
- [119]
- Gerretzen, Jan Gerard
1940 Schola Hemsterhusiana. De herleving der Grieksche studiën aan de Nederlandsche universiteiten in de achttiende eeuw van Perizonius tot en met Valckenaer. Nijmegen & Utrecht: Dekker & Van de Vegt.
- Golling, Joseph
1904 Review of Hoogvliet (1903). Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie 21, cols. 1006-1008.
- Groenendaal, J. van [= Ginneken, Jacobus Joannes Antonius]
1903 Psychologische taalwetenschap. In: Taal en Letteren 13, 408-424, 545-562.
- Hessing, Jacob
1928 Proeve eener voorbereiding tot wijsgeerige spraakleer. In: De Idee. Orgaan van het Bolland-genootschap voor zuivere rede 6, 209-281.
- Hoogvliet, Jan Marius
1895 Grondbeginselen der Algemeene of Univerzele Spraakleer. Bestemd om als grondslag te dienen voor de wetenschappelijke studie van doode en levende, Indo-europeesche en niet-Indo-europeesche talen. Wageningen: privately printed.
- Hulshof, Harm
1985 C.H. den Hertog als grammaticus. Muiderberg: Coutinho.

- Hulsker, Johannes Lucas Maria
 1991 Petrus Montanus' Spreekonst (1635) nader besproken. Doctoral diss. Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen.
 1992 Petrus Montanus as a Phonetician and a Theoretician. In: Noordegraaf, Versteegh & Koerner, 85-108.
- Jongeneelen, Gerrit H.
 1992 Lambert ten Kate and the Origin of 19th-Century Historical Linguistics". In: Noordegraaf, Versteegh & Koerner, 201-219.
- le Loux-Schuringa, Jetske Anne
 1985 Samenhangrelaties in de 19e-eeuwse zinsgrammatica in Nederland. Dordrecht & Cinnaminson: Foris.
- Luhrman, Gerard Johannes
 1984 C.L. Pasius, T. Linacer, J.C. Scaliger en hun beschouwing van het werkwoord. Een kritisch-vergelijkende studie omtrent XVIde-eeuwse taalkundige theorievorming. Groningen: Dijkstra Niemeyer.
- Naumann, Bernd
 1986 Grammatik der deutschen Sprache zwischen 1781 und 1856. Berlin: Erik Schmidt Verlag.
- Noordegraaf, Jan
 1979 Zeydelaar, Gottsched en John Quincy Adams. Een grammaticale relatie. In: De Nieuwe Taalgids 72, 231-235.
 1982 Algemene grammatica en logische analyse. Nederlandse taalkunde in de jaren vijftig van de negentiende eeuw. In: Voortgang, jaarboek voor de Neerlandistiek 3, 174-208.
 1985 Norm, geest en geschiedenis. Nederlandse taalkunde in de negentiende eeuw. Dordrecht & Cinnaminson: Foris.
 1987 Dèr Mouw contra Hoogvliet. Universele grammatica anno 1903. Schiedam: Huis te Riviere Pers.
 1990 National Traditions and Linguistic Historiography. The Case of General Grammar in the Netherlands. In: Hüllen, Werner (Ed.): Understanding the Historiography of Linguistics. Problems and Projects. Münster: Nodus 1990, 287-302.
 1991 Hendrik J. Pos (1898-1955) and the History of Linguistics. In: Feldbusch, Elisabeth, Reiner Pogarell & Cornelia Weiss (Eds.), Neue Fragen der Linguistik. Akten des 25. Linguistisches Kolloquiums, Paderborn 1990. Band 1: Bestand und Entwicklung. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 55-63 [120]
 1992 Hoogvliet versus van Ginneken. Dutch Linguistics around the Turn of the Century. In: Noordegraaf, Versteegh & Koerner, 273-304.
 1994 Women and Grammar: the case of Johanna Corleva. In: Histoire Epistémologie Langage 16.1, 169-190.
- Noordegraaf, Jan, Kees Versteegh & Konrad Koerner (Eds.)
 1992 The History of Linguistics in the Low Countries. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: J. Benjamins 1992.
- Peeters, Leopold
 1990 Lambert ten Kate (1674-1731) en de achttiende-eeuwse taalwetenschap. In: Traditie en progressie. Handelingen van het 40ste Nederlands Filologencongres. 's-Gravenhage: SDU Uitgeverij, 151-160.
- Padley, George Arthur
 1976 Grammatical Theory in Western Europe 1500-1700. The Latin Tradition. Cambridge, etc.: Cambridge University
- Pos, Hendrik Josephus
 1924-32 Lectures on General Linguistics. Unpubl. mss., Pos Archives, Amsterdam Univ. Library.

- Rademaker, Cornelis Simon Maria
1988 Gerardus Johannes Vossius (1577-1649) and the Study of Latin Grammar. In: Noordegraaf, Versteegh & Koerner, 109-128.
- Riemens, Kornelis J.
1919 Esquisse historique de l'enseignement du Français en Hollande du XVIIe au XIXe siècle. Leyde: A.W. Sijthoff.
- Roorda, Taco
1852 Over de deelen der rede en de rede-ontleding, of logische analyse der taal, tot grondslag voor wetenschappelijke taalstudie. Leeuwarden: G.T.N. Suringar.
1855 Javaansche Grammatica. Amsterdam: Johannes Müller.
- Ruijsendaal, Elise
1991 Letterkonst. Het klassieke grammaticamodel en de oudste Nederlandse grammatica's. Amsterdam: VU Uitgeverij.
- Schaars, Frans A.M.
1988 De Nederduitsche Spraakkunst (1706) van Arnold Moonen (1644-1711). Wijhe: Quarto.
- Schlieben-Lange, Brigitte
1992 La Grammaire Générale dans les Écoles Centrales. In: Schlieben-Lange a.o., Band 3, 213-262.
- Schlieben-Lange, Brigitte a.o. (Eds.)
1989-1994 Europäische Sprachwissenschaft um 1800. Methodologische und historiographische Beiträge zum Umkreis der "idéologie". 4 vols. Münster: Nodus Publikationen.
- Schobinger, Jean-Pierre (Ed.)
1993 Die Philosophie des 17. Jahrhunderts. Band 2: Frankreich und die Niederlande. Zweiter Halbband. (= Grundriss der geschichte der Philosophie, begründet von Friedrich Überweg. Völlig neubearbeitete Ausgabe). Basel: Schwabe & Co.
- Spekkens, J.P.L.
1951 L'École centrale du Département de la Meuse-Intérieure, Maastricht 1798-1804. Maastricht.
- Stellmacher, Dieter
1992 Die Niederländische Grammatikforschung im Überblick vom 16. bis 19. Jahrhundert. In: Predota, Stanislaus (Ed.), Studia Neerlandica et Germanica (= Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis, 1356), 405-418. Wrocław: Uniwersytet Wrocławski. [121]
- Teeuw, Andries
1971 Foreword. In: van der Tuuk, Herman Neubronner, A Grammar of Toba Batak. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, xiii-xl. [Transl. of H. N. van der Tuuk Tobasche Spraakkunst. Amsterdam: F. Muller, 1864-1867.]
- Tsiapera, Maria & Garon Wheeler
1993 The Port-Royal Grammar. Sources and Influences. Münster: Nodus Publikationen.
- Uhlenbeck, Eugenius Marius
1964 A Critical Survey of Studies on the Languages of Java and Madura. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Verburg, Pieter Adrianus
1952 Taal en Functionaliteit. Een historisch-critische studie over de opvattingen aangaan de functies der taal. Wageningen: Veenman. (English translation: Language and its Functions. A historico-critical study of views concerning the functions of language from the pre-humanistic philology of Orleans to the rationalistic philology of Bopp. Transl. by Paul B. Salmon. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins 1998).

- 1981 Ars oder Scientia, eine Frage der Sprachbetrachtung im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert. In: Geckeler, Horst a.o. (Eds.): Logos Semantikos. Studia in honorem Eugenio Coseriu 1921-1981. Berlin/ New York: de Gruyter & Madrid: Gredos, 207-214.
- Visser, Robert Paul Willem
1974 "Bilderdijk en de natuurwetenschappen". In: De Nieuwe Taalgids 67, 288-299.
- de Vooy, Cornelis Gerrit Nicolaas
1952 Een Nederlandse stijllee uit het begin van de negentiende eeuw. In: De Nieuwe Taalgids 45, 157-159.
- van der Wal, Maria Jacoba
1977 De Taaltheorie van Johannes Kinker. Leiden: Vakgroep Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde.
1984 The Language Theory of Johannes Kinker (1764-1845). In: Auroux, Sylvain a.o (Eds.): Matériaux pour une histoire des théories linguistiques. Lille: Université de Lille III, 347-353.
1985 The Kantian Mentalism of Johannes Kinker (1764-1845). In: Topoi 4, 151-153.
- Weiß, Helmut
1992 Universalgrammatiken aus der ersten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts in Deutschland. Historisch-systematische Untersuchung einer terra incognita. Münster: Nodus Publikationen.
- Whitney, William Dwight
1875 The Life and Growth of Language. London: Henry S. King. (Repr., Hildesheim & New York: Georg Olms, 1970.)
- te Winkel, Lammert Allard te
1858 De Logische Analyse: Beschouwingen naar aanleiding van Prof. T. Roorda's Rede-ontleding of de logische analyse der taal. I. Zutphen: Willem Thieme.
1859 De Logische Analyse: Antwoord op de bedenkingen van prof. T. Roorda's Rede-ontleding en Dr. Q. N. tegen het werkje, getiteld: Beschouwingen naar aanleiding van Prof. T. Roorda's Rede-ontleding of de logische analyse der taal. II. Zutphen: Willem Thieme.
1860 Over de noodzakelijkheid der toepassing van de stelling: een woord staat onmiddellijk alleen in betrekking tot eene voorstelling. In: De Taalgids 2, 169-187.